

REMARKS

This is an amendment and response to the office action mailed June 18, 2012. Please amend claims 1 and 12 and cancel claims 3 and 14. Claims 1–2, 4–13, 15–22, and 25–26 are pending in this application. Although these claims have been amended, added, and/or canceled herein to provide clarification, correct typographical inaccuracies and/or informalities, and/or to better track practical/commercial implementations/practices (hereinafter “amendment,” “amendments,” and/or “amended”), Applicant submits that the originally filed claims are patentable and reserve the right to pursue the originally filed claims (as well as any claims dependent therefrom) at a later time and/or in one or more continuation/divisional application(s). Applicant submits that these new claims and/or claim amendments are supported throughout the originally filed specification and that no new matter has been added by way of the amendments.

Applicant respectfully submits that the invention, as defined by pending claims 1–2, 4–13, 15–22, and 25–26 is patentable over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the following remarks:

The Examiner rejected claims 1–5, 7–10, 12–16, 18–21, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0230481 to Bushold (hereinafter “Bushold”), in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,836,537 to Zirngibl (hereinafter “Zirngibl”), and U.S. Pat. No. 6,512,964 to Quackenbush (hereinafter “Quackenbush”). The Examiner also rejected claims 6 and 17 as being unpatentable over Bushold in view of Zirngibl, Quackenbush, and U.S. Pat. No. 5,854,837 to Trader. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 11 and 22 as being unpatentable over Bushold in view of Zirngibl, Quackenbush, and U.S. Pat. No. 6,282,649 to Lambert.

Referring to independent claims 1 and 12, Applicant respectfully submits that Bushold, Zirngibl, and Quackenbush, alone or in combination do not disclose, and are in fact missing, at

least the following elements, *inter alia*, “upon a selection by said user to place the selected itinerary on hold: placing said selected itinerary on hold for a predetermined amount of time; providing said user a reference number indicative of said selected itinerary to enable later retrieval of said selected itinerary; and canceling the selected itinerary if said user does not ticket the held selected itinerary within the predetermined amount of time” and “acquiring baggage data from said user, wherein the baggage data comprises arrival date; determining whether the arrival date is within a predetermined threshold; if the arrival date is within said predetermined threshold, querying a baggage database with said baggage data for information in said baggage database and providing said information to said user; and if the arrival date is outside said predetermined threshold, transferring said user to an operator.”

Bushold’s system provides only for booking a selected itinerary, but not holding the selected itinerary for a predetermined amount of time, giving a reference number for that selected itinerary for later retrieval, and canceling it if it is not booked within the predetermined amount of time, as required by currently amended claims 1 and 12. Zirngibl teaches a telephone notification and execution system, but fails to teach holding the selected itinerary as required by currently amended claims 1 and 12. Bushold and Zirngibl also fail to teach acquiring baggage data from the user. Quackenbush teaches a system and method for arranging the transportation of baggage for airline passengers, but, like Bushold and Zirngibl, he fails to teach holding the selected itinerary as required by currently amended claims 1 and 12. Quackenbush also fails to teach acquiring arrival date from the user, determining whether the arrival date is within a predetermined threshold, and if it is, providing baggage information to the user, and if it is not, transferring the user to an operator.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Bushold, Zirngibl, and Quackenbush, alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or render obvious the features of currently amended independent claims 1 and 12. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 12 are patentable over Bushold, Zirngibl, and Quackenbush. Dependent claims 2, 4–11, 13, 15–22, and 25–26 are patentable by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 12. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1–5, 7–10, 12–16, 18–21, 25, and 26.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and therefore Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections and allowance of pending claims 1–5, 7–10, 12–16, 18–21, 25, and 26.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

This response is being filed with a Request for Continue Examination and a petition for a two months extension of time. If any other petitions and/or other fees are required, the Patent and Trademark Office is specifically authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 23-0420 in the name of Ward & Zinna, LLC.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 9, 2012

/ Hanna Bondarik Mosolygo/
Hanna Bondarik Mosolygo
Reg. No. 66,475
Ward & Zinna LLC
382 Springfield Avenue
Suite 300
Summit, New Jersey 07901
(908) 277-3333